Attachment # 2
Page of 5

Board of County Commissioners

Budget Discussion Item

Date of Meeting:

June 14, 2005

Date Submitted:

June 8, 2005

To:

Honorable Chairman and Members of the Board

From:

Parwez Alam, County Administrator

Kim Dressel, Management Services Director

Alan Rosenzweig, Director, Office of Management & Budget 1

Subject:

Energy Performance Contract for County Facilities

Statement of Issue:

This discussion item seeks authorization to proceed with the development of an energy performance contract for County building facilities.

Background:

On April 26, 2005, the Board approved a request to cancel its workshop with Energy Systems Group (ESG), regarding the investment-grade energy audit and a proposed energy savings performance contract, which had been scheduled for May 10, 2005 (attachment 1). The request to cancel this workshop was made because the long-term savings of this project did not significantly exceed the associated costs. Additionally the contract was to include third party implementation, and a ten to twelve year outside financing arrangement. The April project proposal brought by ESG would only have resulted in a net savings of only \$12,287, after twelve years of debt repayment, with a total project investment by the County of \$6,571,450 (which included a \$4,965,658 project cost and \$1,605,792 debt service cost). The original proposal did not offer significant enough savings to the County to justify its costs.

Upon agreeing to cancel the original workshop, the Board also directed staff to bring back an agenda item to see if staff and representatives of ESG could arrive at a refined project proposal that could prove to be more fiscally sound to the County. Successive adjusted proposals received from ESG have consisted of a guaranteed net savings of \$850,965, after twelve years of debt repayment, following a total project investment of \$5,832,269 (which includes a \$4,466,238 project cost and \$1,366,031 debt service cost). The revised proposal will result in a guaranteed net savings of \$836,678 more than the savings proposed in April. The refined proposal has been proven to be in the best interest of Leon County, and is hereby recommended to be further developed into the required performance agreement that is authorized by Florida Statute, and approved by the Board.

Accompanying this item are the current Energy Conservation Measure (ECM) selections, and 12-year Cash Flow Analysis Summary worksheets, as provided to the County by ESG are attached (Attachment #2). Also, a spreadsheet indicating the various cost reductions and saving increases, that have occurred through recent staff dealings with ESG (Attachment #3).

Budget Workshop: Energy Performance Contract for County Facilities

June 14, 2005

Page 2

Analysis:

As can be seen from the contractor's proposal, the proposed project consists of 13 selected ECMs, out of a field of 37 total ECMs which have been technically reviewed by both ESG and County staff, over the past several months. These projects consist of the following:

Summary of Final Proposed Energy Control Measure Selections

I. Board of County Commission Projects:

Two projects at the Leon County Courthouse	\$ 809,477
One project at the Bank of America property	\$ 139,514
One combined central heating/cooling plant	\$1,808,209
Two projects at all other outlying County facilities	\$ 268,111
Six Total Projects	\$3,025,311

II. Leon County Sheriff's Department Projects:

Four projects at the Leon County Jail	\$1,280,817
Three projects at the Sheriff's Admin Facility	\$ 160.109
Seven Total Projects	\$1,440,926

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Grand Total 13 P	rojects at cost of	\$4,466,237
		

These projects consist of energy-conscious enhancements to the noted building heating and cooling systems, lighting system upgrades, computerized control system equipment and additional water conservation measures.

Financing:

The proposed ECMs were selected on the basis of their optimized costs, versus the energy savings potential, and is reflected within the computed simple payback periods. Additionally, ECMs with longer payback periods were selected to meet immediate capital improvement needs. The resulting energy savings program, therefore, offers the County a 9.5-year simple payback period, which is the period of time it will take for the energy savings that are realized to exceed the total project costs. Energy performance contracts with simple paybacks that are below 20-years, are considered good by performance contracting standards, whereas simple paybacks that fall below 10-years are considered as excellent. Shorter payback periods also offer the ability for the financing of costs within a reasonable term for life expectancy of the equipment being purchased, and will coincide with any new systems or equipment that is provided.

At the May 26, 2005 meeting of the Leon County Finance Advisory committee recommended that financing for the Energy Performance Contract with ESG would bid by the ESG. The County's Financial Advisor David Moore with Public Financial Management Group, and the County's Bondo

Attachment # 2
Page 3 of 6

Budget Workshop: Energy Performance Contract for County Facilities

June 14, 2005

Page 3

Attorney Jolinda Herring will provide review of all documents. ESG will have no role in the financing aside from coordinating the bid process. The \$4.7 million project cost will be financed for a term to of twelve years. The energy savings realized from the implementation of this program will pay the remainder of the debt-service for all 12 years of the borrowing term (attachment 1).

Conclusion:

At the April 26, 2005 Board Meeting, the Board directed staff to continuing working ESG with the expectation that ESG would make one more good faith effort to propose a list projects and corresponding energy savings that would bring a better value to the County's facilities and the County's five year Capital Improvement Plan. After a revised project and equipment price list was presented by ESG to County Staff, it is evident that the energy savings will cover the costs of the projects and the debt service while providing much needed capital improvements to county facilities.

Options:

- 1. Authorize staff to proceed with the development of an energy performance contract with ESG for the benefit of County building facilities, and to present this information to the Board for formal approval at a regular-scheduled meeting. Authorize ESG to solicit bids associated with the financing of this project.
- 2. Do not authorize staff to proceed with an energy performance contract or to have any further dealings with ESG on energy savings.
- 3. Board direction.

Recommendation:

Option #1 is contemplated in the tentative budget

Attachments:

- 1. April 26, 2005 Agenda Item
- 2. ESG's final proposed ECM selections and cash flow summary
- 3. Staff spreadsheet regarding recent project improvements

PA/KD/AR

Board of County Commissioners Agenda Request 16

Date of Meeting:

April 26, 2005

Date Submitted:

April 20, 2005

To:

Honorable Chairman and Members of the Board

From:

Parwez Alam, County Administrator

Kim Dressel, Management Services Director

Subject:

Approval to Cancel the May 10, 2005 Workshop on Investment-Grade Energy Audit of County

Facilities

Statement of Issue:

This agenda item seeks Board approval to cancel the workshop scheduled for Tuesday, May 10, 2005, from 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. with Energy Systems Group (ESG), regarding the investment-grade energy audit of County facilities.

Background:

On December 9, 2003, Progress Energy Solutions (PES), a subsidiary of Progress Energy (formerly Florida Power Corporation) was selected by the Board as its energy savings contractor (ESCO) and placed under contract to perform an investment-grade energy audit of County facilities for a cost of \$150,519 (Attachment #1). It was anticipated that the energy audit would detail the feasibility and costs of energy enhancements that may be funded through a long-term financing arrangement, according to State Statute, and made possible through the pledge of our guaranteed future reduced energy consumption costs.

• If the energy audit did not identify projects that would yield sufficient savings to offset the debt service required to pay the capital costs for the projects, then the company would absorb the audit costs.

• If the Board pursued completion of the energy savings projects identified through the audit, the cost of the audit would be rolled into the costs of the projects and retired via debt service over the prescribed project repayment period.

• There was a direct cost of the audit only if the Board did not pursue the energy savings projects (and those projects would have yielded sufficient energy savings to offset the debt service to pay the capital costs for the projects).

PES was later sold to ESG, a subsidiary of Vectron Corporation (a Midwestern electric utility). The company defaulted under the terms of its contract, which expired without timely completing a final version of the energy audit.

On September 2, 2004, the management of ESG met with staff to request authorization to complete the energy audits outside of the expired contract. 'As ESG agreed it would complete and deliver the audits at no cost to the County (Attachment #2), staff agreed to continue to participate in the energy audit process.

ESG has subsequently completed the energy audit and has delivered a set of energy audit documents to the County, which details recommended energy savings projects, their costs, and projected annual savings (largely realized through reduced energy and water consumption). The project costs do not significantly exceed anticipated savings. Therefore, staff is recommending that the County not further pursue energy savings projects through this process. It is further noted that the County has no contract with ESG, and can end this without cost.

View Agenda '16'

Analysis:

Attachment # 2

This agenda item represents a long-term exploration by staff, and each of the above noted energy savings firms, into Leon County's various opportunities and alternatives pertaining to additional energy conservation measures. However, in the end, it appears that the County has already employed a number of exceedingly reliable energy savings measures on its own, such that the various opportunities and alternatives which remain appears to be very limited at best.

The Leon County Finance Advisory Committee recently reviewed proposed project results and questioned if this was the most cost effective mechanism to pursue the work. It is anticipated to take more than eight years for the anticipated savings to offset the project costs. Some of the projects were recommended based solely on the projected energy savings alone (such as replacing toilets in the jail with systems that utilize less water and changing lighting fixtures). However staff would recommend the pursuit of other projects for reasons other than potential energy savings (such as raising the Courthouse ventilation intake to the roof). These projects, however, can be delivered less expensively through normal contracting procedures and considered for funding through the budget process.

It is staff's recommendation to forego any further third-party involvement in energy savings issues, and for the County to continue to elect and self-perform its own additional energy conservation measures at reduced costs, which will maximize the available benefits to be received.

Nevertheless, if the Board opts to further explore the concept of employing additional energy conservation measures in general through the available services of a qualified energy savings company in particular, then staff recommends a 90-day postponement and re-scheduling of the Board workshop on this issue for Tuesday, September 13, 2005, from 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Options:

 Cancel the workshop on Investment-Grade Energy Audit of County Facilities scheduled for May 10, 2005, from 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. and do not further pursue a project agreement with Energy Systems Group.

2. Re-schedule the Board workshop on Investment-Grade Energy Audit of County facilities for Tuesday, September 13, 2005, from 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

3. Do not cancel the workshop on Investment-Grade Energy Audit of County Facilities.

4. Do not re-schedule the workshop on Investment-Grade Energy Audit of County Facilities.

5. Board direction.

Recommendation;

Option #1.

Attachments:

1. December 9, 2003 Agenda Item and Follow-up

2. Letter from Energy Systems Group

Back | Print

Attachment # 3 Page 6 of 8

LEON County Government ESG-SE

FINAL ECM Selection, 12 year Term

1 Commune	Continues Unique Continues Value Continues Continues Continues Value Continues Continues Continues Value Continues Continues Continues Continues Continues Continues Value Continues Conti	ŧ	A 584	Building or	Description	1	Energy Savings		Operations	Sevings		Total	Project	
Compare Comp	Compared Communication 19.54 5644 51/1967 51962 51	-4	┪	Facility		Payback	Electric	1. 1) j	Material	Other	Savings	Comb	
Libery L	United Commission Control United Con	_		OUSe	Rooftop OA Pre-conditioner	19.54	菱	\$17,967		9695		19,357	3378,250	
Marker Compared Marker Common Marker Com	Marker Conservation 12.44 445.507 11.572			9370	Lightfing Controls				Ĺ		!			
Heart Comparison Control String Heart	Fig. Composite Contentwater Content Co		Court	200	EMS Enhancements	2	CE 303	C48 080	:	4 043	 	645 645	Certe par	
Section Comparison Control C	Comparison Control Con	+	15 Courted	No.	Water Conservation				+					
Part	Section Comparison Compar	+	0	M CHROA CSP.	Commonlin Confindingtion Block	45.40	0 474 ABA	A 45 ANT	•	-	+		14	
Complete	Compared	4.	T		Signature Defendit and Control	14.70	70'4	1800		37,CIC	+	2744,800	\$1,000,209	
Common Service Comm	Complex Comp	+	Τ	-						1	1	****		
Controls Enhancements Charles C	Commission Com	4	\$ \$		CHES - CHE MINISTERING MINISTERING COMPO	Í								
Controls Extractive Controls Control Controls	Controls Edition Production Controls Control	٠.	₹ •		2 firs - MZ AHUS to VAV			a		¦ i	 		:	
United States and Common United States and U	Library Variable Conservation Variable Princessorial Variable Conservation Variable Conserva	_	8 0		Controls Enhancements / OA & TB	₹83	520.003	55041		\$1015	 	C24 215	Cito K44	
Dienty Variable Primary Flow	Diency Universe Commenced	_	& ¥08	TOCK	Lightling Retroft and Controls	: -					+			
Unitary Visitation Control	Dibrary Vientale Primary Primary Vientale Primary Primary Vientale Primary Primary Vientale Primary Primary Upining Primar	_	Z BOA №	Ž	DX to CHWA-W Conversion				;		1	<u> </u>		
Library Vertible Primary Flow Library Vertible Speci (T F Fm Library Vertible Speci (T F	Liberty Variable Primary Flow	٠	Š		Water Conservation	1		Ĩ : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :		-	<u> </u>	:	:	
Library Control of Attly Feas Library	Library Control of Attly Feas Library Library Library Control of Attly Feas Library Librar	_	+	Valley Person	Market District Control			1					;	
Library Variable Speed Of Fan Combos	Library Libr	.1	4-	7	Ventions Thereasy Flow	:								
Liberay Variations Speed CT Fan	Library Variations Library Variations Library Variations Library Variations Library Li	٠.	-/)-		Lightery retroit and Controls						!		:	
Unkny Virt O Control of A AUT Sense State	Library Vivi Control of A-VI Feat	_	딕	Zaline Library	Variable Speed CT Fan			: -		!	 	: : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :	i	
Library HAVIC Coverage Expansion Control	Library HAG Control Library	_	=	Willing Library	VFD Control of AHU Fans	 			+		İ	<u> </u>	,	
Library WAC Coverage Entercaments 50 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 1	Library MAC Coveride Entracements 50	_	_	Jollins Library					:	1	:		: : :	•
Charter	Complete Wisher Conservation HAVIC ANT Replacemental HAVIC ANT		-	Variati Prav		į		1		!	,	!!!		
MAC AND Replacemental MAC	HVIC AND Replacementalization HVIC Extended Replacementaliza	+	۳	Alles I Breeze		+ -		3						
MACANI MACANI Macaniment	MACA AND Replacement of the control of the contro			Die Chiefe's	When Course value	-		3						
MACAPULAL Lighting, Cornious, et al. 7.50 \$22,378 \$5.50 \$5.50	Madeument & Vertication Madeument & Vert	4	1	(man) (man)	TIVAL ATU REPRESENEMENTE									
Upything, Controls, et al. 7,50 \$22,379 \$25,574	Complex Comp		_	-	HVAC AHU Replacement/duct					1	-			;
Lighting Controls, et al. 6.25 \$11,578 \$500 Lighting Controls, et al. 6.25 \$11,578 \$500 Lighting Revolutian and Control 5.56 \$51,014 \$469 \$1,790 Lighting Revolutian and Control 10.14 \$20,000 \$3,772 \$1,020 Lighting Revolutian for Heading HW 10.14 \$20,000 \$3,772 \$1,020 Lighting Revolutian and Control 10.14 \$20,000 \$3,773 \$11,560 Lighting Revolutian and Control 10.14 \$20,000 \$2,703 \$10,000 Lighting Revolutian and Control 10.14 \$20,000 \$10,000 Lighting Revolutian and Control 10.14 \$20,000 \$2,703 \$200 Lighting Revolutian and Control 10.14 \$20,000 \$2,703 Lighting Revolutian and Control 10.14 \$20,000 \$2,703 Lighting Revolutian and Control 10.14 \$2,000 \$2,703 Lighting Revolutian and Control 10.14 \$2,000 \$2,000 Lighting Revolutian and Control 10.14 \$2,000 \$2,000 Lighting Revolution 10.14 \$2,000 Lighting Revolution 10.14 \$2,000 \$2,000 Lighting Revolutio	Lighting Controls, et al. 6.25 \$11,578 \$500	_:	_		Lighting, Controls, et at	7.50	27.170			40.00	+	45-6		ì
Lighting Relatedit and Caratrols 5.56 \$51 (014 \$4568 \$1.786 \$1.	Lighting Remail and Controls 5.56 \$51 (614 \$4.66 \$1.785		-	١.	Libhting Controls at al		644 970	 	† i	1		\$400.000	727	
Complex Nantural Entering HW 2.405 51,000 51,00	Complete Controls Editor (1) Children Chil	1	Η.		Cabilities Referent and Controls		0/2/14			2		511,766	\$73,500	
Use Search Bolber for Healing HW 3.84 \$65,233 -51,996 \$1,022	Use Shean Bolder for Heafing HW 3.84 \$465,233 \$1,020		-		Bordoon (1) Chiller of EOO LEC Law	R	10,104	3	!!!!	2		\$52,351	\$282,376	
Controls Enhancements Controls Enhancement	Controls Enhancements State Stat		٠		THE CHARLES OF THE CONTRACT OF	1								ļ
Complex Vision Fold Manufacture State	Complex Visit Service Complex Visit Service Visit Se	:	۲		OSE CHEST DOME TO LINE THE	-					-		•	
Controls Enhancements	Controls Enhancements		3			3.04	\$65,233	-\$1,966		\$1820	-	CR4 887	F746 048	:
Complex Wester Active Servings (Copen) 10.144 10.	Peak-MW-Sawkoga (Copan) (10.14) Walan-Complex Upfiring Relocks and Controls in Complex Variable Primary Flow in Com	٠.	3. X		Controls Enhancements	00'6	23.250	\$4 000	+ :-	5	+	100100	0.7	:
Wester Conservation Wester Conservation 10.144 \$258,632 \$578,655 \$778 \$779 \$7	Micropiese Visible Pirmary Flow in Complex Visible Finance Consistency State S		22		Peak-KW-Savings (Copen)			+			-			
Min Complete Uplining Retrorts and Contacts A. 78 \$20.632 \$72445 \$7716 \$	win Complex Viriable Primary Flow in Complex Viriable Representation in Complex Viriable Representation \$2.40 \$2.793 \$2.594 \$2.793 \$2.793 \$2.793 \$2.793 \$2.793 \$2.793	_	_		Water Conservation	25.05	:			+ 1111111111111111111111111111111111111			i	
Min Complex: Wasted Pitmany Reports and Chell Complex: Wasted Pitmany Retroit and Chell Complex: Was - Lighting Retroit and Chell Complex: Was - Lighting Retroit and Chell Chell Complex: Was - HVAC Enterconners and Complex: Was - Editer Replacement and Complex: Waster Conservation 5.36 \$2.70	Min Complete: Varieties Primary Flow in Complete: Varieties Primary Flow in Complete: Varieties Primary Flow in Complete: Varieties Primary Retrofit and Child in Complete: Varieties Reducement in Varieties Reducement in Complete: Varieties Reducement in Varieties Reduceme			Admin Commune	Saldens Dates to Cont.			8	_	8		\$66.474	253,152	
The Complete Visa - Lighting Relations and Confidence Management and Complete Visa - Lighting Relations and Confidence	in Complex Contract Enhancements in Complex Vice - Lighting Retroft and Onl in Complex Vice - Lighting Retroft and Onl in Complex Vice - House Replacements in Complex Vice - Boiler Replacement in		_	Africa Company	Committee of the Commit	ē!	23,83	200		\$778		\$29.105	2138	
An Complex Vice - Lighting Reference 2.40 \$2.703 \$564 \$207 in Complex Vice - Botter Replacement 5.36 \$2.30 \$5.30 \$	The Complex Controls Enhancements (2.40 \$2,793 \$207 \$207 \$207 \$207 \$207 \$207 \$207 \$207		_	Action Control	Veriginal Parties y Flow						!!!			
thin Complex West-Lighting Restroffs and Orel 2.40 \$2.793 \$564 \$207	thin Compiles. West - Lighting Restroit and Orel 2.40 \$2.79 \$564 \$207			Admin Compan	Controls Enhancements	<u> </u>				•	+	!		
This Complete View - HVAC Enterconnerts 2.40 \$2.703 \$564 \$207	min Complex Vice - HVAC Enterconnerts 2.40 \$2.793 \$564 \$207 Water Conservation 5.36 \$2.793 \$18		Series S	1 Admin Complex		†	· !	+		_	 	; ;		
win Complete: Water Conservation 5.36 \$2.00 \$2.00 \$1.0	with Complete. Without Conservation 5.36 \$2.30 \$18			Admin Commen		1					i			
The Complex Wester Tonservetion 5.36 \$18.	in Complex Water Conservation 5.36 \$18					2.7	22,783	3		è		\$3,564	28.548	
Nesturment & Vertication	This Complex Weather Conservation 5:36 \$18		_		WC9 - Boiler Replacement				_		-	i L		
Meseument & Verification	Meseument & Verification		_	s Admin Complex	Wahar Conservation	180		3,20		+	+	977.00		
								200		•	+	37.410	\$12,948	
		_			1	+	:				:			
		_	2-01 All Bull		Management & Verification				,					
0.3		_									-			
3			<u></u>											
		٠,										,		
		_	<u>.</u>		•									
		_									1			
		_									•			
														1

Leon County Government

FINAL ECM Selection, 12 year Term, 3 Years M&V Cash Flow Analysis Summary

	Count Period	Aller		7		•	9	•	 -	-	•	10	11	12	TOTAL
PROGRAM SAYMES															
Energy Savings	*	3,675	570,307	_	70	****	\$ 416,783	•	442,166		200'807 1	\$ 452,186	\$ 497,061	\$ 512,58H	770,515,677
Operational Sentrols		2 2 2	20 007	_	5 40 Set		\$ 42,222	**	12,028	44,807	16,703	\$ 46,617	•	\$ 48,500	\$121S
Water Sevinos	**	28,336	5 316 5	\$ 61,096			\$ 68,760	\$ 68,765	829'04	_	75,130	\$ 77,383	\$ 79.715	\$ 62,107	\$ 870,143
Annual Greek Sevings	•	2.38	468,629		******	790'014 \$	\$ 626,786	\$ 541,117	806,910	677,198	100,000 8	_	*		\$ 6,714,534
Cumulativa Savings	s s	2 3 2	629,894	\$ 960,927	\$ 1,447,296	\$ 1,968,150	\$ 2,483,916 \$	\$ 3,026,033	\$ 3,541,962	4,156,140	4,745,075	\$ 6,362,262	11.778,8	\$ 6,620,575	
ANNUAL CONTINUEDUTION		H								 - -					
		-													
PROGRAM COSTS	4		446,022	\$ 406.022	\$ 466,022	\$ 486,022	486.022	\$ 466,022	\$ 4m 022	2003	\$ 486,022	5 466,022	\$ 406.022	\$ 486,022	\$ 5.002.200
Arevest Mornoring and Verific	**	•	11,000	100	•	*	,							•	
Annuel Gross Costs	•		1 487,022 1	\$ 486,022	22X 989 \$	\$ 444,822	\$ 486,022	\$ 486,822	229'947 8	6 4466,022 S	229'887	\$ 484,022	\$ 466,021	\$ 486,022	\$ 5,863,689
Cumulative Costs			487,022	\$ 540,000 \$	₹.	\$ 1,975,390	\$ 2,481,412	\$ 2,947,434	25438,457	8 3.919.478	4,406,502	125'LOS'T \$	\$ 5,377,647	8 5,883,588	
CASH FLOW									•						
Annual Net Cash Flow	_	84,156 \$	\$ (536/92) \$	1 (11,724)		1 22,22	\$ 38,743 \$	\$ 25,084	\$ 784,87 \$	\$ 87,166 \$	\$ 103,913 \$	\$ 121,164	\$ 138,803 \$	\$ 157,175 \$	\$ 850,965
Cumulative Net Cash Flow		94,160 \$	66,766	\$ 190'69 \$	\$ 100'25 \$	\$ 78,919 \$	\$ 116,863	\$ 171,757 \$	\$ 242,664	\$ 819,856 \$	\$ 455,732	\$ 554,866	\$ 683,788	\$ 596'058 \$	\$ 850,966

Financial Burningsy	ř
Program Cost	\$ 4,466,238
Interior Internet	\$ 100,801
Amount Financed	\$ 4,576,077
Arrund Program Savings Simple Paydack (years)	\$ 488,629
Actual Interest Pale Financia Peded Psymethe per Year Total Interest Programma	4.20% 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12
Energy Escalation	350 rs
Construction Period 1st Year M&V Fee 2nd Year M&V Fee Anneal M&V Exception	\$11,000 000,118 000,018

Attachment # 7 of 8

Page .

